LABOR POWER

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Volume 1 | FEBRUARY, 1940 | Number 9

TRUST-BUSTING OR UNION-BUSTING?

DE LEON AND AMERICAN LABOR (II)

DOES LABOR "SHARE" WITH CAPITAL

THE WORKER AND "CO-OPERATION"

REFLECTIONS ON FORCE AND VIOLENCE

ORGANIZATION NOTES

Published by the Socialist Union Party,
1301 Boston Road, New York, N. Y.

PRICE 5 CENTS

ORGANIZATION NOTES

BRANCH LOS ANGELES

Since our last report National Organizer William Briggs has arrived in Los Angeles. Immediately on his arrival, Comrade Briggs plunged into party work and is giving an excellent account of himself. Inspired by his activity, our hard working Los Angeles comrades are redoubling their own efforts to put the Socialist Union Party on the map on the West Coast and in the vanguard of the labor movement.

The Branch's new commodious headquarters were formally opened Christmas Eve with a jolly house-warming.

The Branch is conducting an open forum which meets every Friday evening at 8 P. M. at headquarters. Comrade Briggs was the opening speaker at the first meeting on January 19th. He spoke on the burning question of "American Neutrality" to a sizable audience. Comrade Briggs hammered home the fraud of the Roosevelt program of American "Neutrality" and his talk was closely followed by the audience and very favorably received. There was a lively and prolonged question and discussion period at the close of the lecture.

For its second speaker the Branch has secured the services of Dave Harris, well-known local lecturer, who will speak on "Fascist Tendencies in America" on Friday, January 26th. A schedule of timely and interesting topics, with competent speakers is being prepared for forthcoming sessions. All workers in Los Angeles and vicinity are invited to attend the meetings of the open forum. There is no charge for admission.

Comrade Briggs has been invited to address the I.W.W. open forum on Sunday, January 29th. A number of other outside speaking engagements are being arranged for him.

BRANCH MINNEAPOLIS

Press of accumulated Party business at headquarters brought the National Secretary's organizational tour in Minneapolis to a close in the latter part of December.

The final session of the study class prior to Comrade Ziegler's departure was devoted to a symposium on the Farmer-Labor Party. The Farmer-Labor Party was represented by Mr. Howard Y. Williams, one of the best known Farmer-Laborite leaders in the state. Comrade Ziegler presented the position of our Party.

The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party, which had been one of the most powerful political forces in the Northwest and the white hope of the reformist Socialists throughout the country, sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of the forces of reaction when its standard-bearer, Gov. Floyd Benson was defeated for re-election in 1938 by the Republican candidate, a young demagogue. The Farmer-Labor Party has since fallen upon evil days.

Mr. Williams stoutly defended the reform program of the Farmer-Labor Party and its policy of class collaboration and political horse-trading with the Roosevelt-Farley New Deal Democratic machine. In rebuttal, Comrade Ziegler pointed to the rout of the Farmer-Labor Party by the reactionary Stassen as brilliant confirmation of the De Leonist position that the bankruptcy of political reform can only serve to prepare the ground for reaction and Fascism. Comrade Ziegler pointed out that the policy of the "lesser evil" which Mr. Williams used to justify the Farmer-Labor compromise with the New Deal, was the same policy which the German Social Democrats pursued in combatting Hitler and that this very policy enabled Hitler to win an easy victory. Only the program of Marxism-De Leonism, the revolutionary political and industrial organization of the working class, can save humanity from the onrushing social catastrophe that threatens to engulf it.

A spirited question and discussion period followed from the floor during which the students subjected the Farmer-Labor program and Mr. William's defense to a thoroughgoing dissection.

The members of Branch Minneapolis have been considerably encouraged as a result of the National Secretary's stay in Minneapolis. A number of valuable con-

(*Continued on Page* 19)

LABOR POWER

Published Monthly by the
SOCIALIST UNION PARTY
1301 Boston Road
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Subscription: — Per Year, 50c; Semi-Annually, 25c; Single Copy, 5c.

Composed & Printed by Voluntary Labor

Vol. 1, No. 9 February, 1940

Editorials . . .

TRUST BUSTING OR UNION BUSTING?

In these days of gathering reaction, it has remained for the New Deal, self-styled "friend" of the working man, to deliver the latest blow against labor organization. Using the old Sherman Anti-Trust Law as a cloak, Thurman Arnold, Assistant Attorney-General in charge of the Anti-Trust Bureau of the Department of Justice, has been conducting a large-scale nationwide drive against the building trades unions, the longshoremen, the teamsters and other workers' organizations. The campaign has already resulted in the indictment of several score union officials and a number of local unions by Federal Grand Juries sitting in Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, Detroit, Washington, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, New Orleans and New York on charges of monopolistic practices and conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of the Anti-Trust Laws.

In the palmiest days of the Republican reactionaries they never dared to stage so wholesale a raid on labor organizations. Mr. Arnold is too smart a politician, however, to proclaim openly that he is engaged in a union-busting campaign. In fact, the first intimation that it was on its way came in June, 1939, when he announced that the Department of Justice was undertaking a "nationwide campaign against combinations that have interrupted progress in the building industry."

The indictments against the unions and their officials have been accompanied by similar indictments against building contractors, construction companies and building material dealers. That these indictments are merely window-dressing, designed to distract attention from the attack on the workers is indicated by Mr. Arnold's statement that members of the industry have privately expressed their thanks to him for his threats to indict their firms and in a number of cases the heads of individual companies voluntarily exposed themselves to prosecution to aid the government. In the face of this noble exhibition of public-spirited altruism, is it perhaps rude to suggest that possibly all this eager exposure to "prosecution" flows from the knowledge that should the New Deal's campaign against the building unions succeed, their power would be considerably weakened if not altogether destroyed? And that if such a result eventuates, our "public-spirited" contractors would be left a clear field for the unhampered exploitation of their workers?

In an effort to appease the mounting resentment of labor, Arnold has made the usual politician's statements to the effect that he is a friend of labor, that he has no intention of interfering with "legitimate" collective bargaining, etc. And to add insult to injury Arnold has the hardihood to cast himself in the role of the knight in shining armor who is out to "take the yoke off the back of labor by ridding it of the control of those who betray its fundamental interests." And how does this champion of the workers propose to free them? Why, by subjecting their organizations and their officials to the provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, a law passed more than fifty years ago for the purpose of curbing the monopolistic practices of the large capitalist enterprises!

Mr Arnold proclaims that the Administration is not opposed to collective bargaining. But collective bargaining is absolutely valueless if it is not backed up by the unrestricted right of labor to employ its coercive economic power in restraint of trade. The employers would have nothing to fear from a unionism whose power to

restrain trade had been effectively hobbled by subjecting it to the provisions of the anti-trust laws. The fact is that the right to strike is a recognition of the right of labor to carry out an absolute restraint of trade. Every strike is successful precisely in the measure that it is effective in restraining the employer's trade.

Arnold recognizes this fact and attempts to escape from his dilemma by conceding that labor has the right to restrain trade in pursuance of "legitimate objectives." But this is merely begging the question. What are and what are not legitimate objectives? Who is to be the judge? Apparently Mr. Arnold is. In his letter to the Indianapolis Central Labor Union laying down the new policy of the Department of Justice, he sets up the following blacklist of labor practices against which he will take action:

1. Preventing the use of cheaper materials, improved equipment or more efficient methods.
2. Compelling the hiring of "standby" labor.
3. Enforcing systems of "graft and corruption."
4. Enforcing prices illegally fixed.
5. Destroying an established and legitimate system of collective bargaining.

In this list it will be noted that Mr. Arnold has lumped together certain practices which are criminal in nature, and thus amenable to ordinary criminal prosecution, with bona-fide labor practices. "Systems of graft and coruption" and agreements to rig prices are not Mr. Arnold's main concern. His object is to break the control of the unions over jobs and working conditions by prosecuting them under the Anti-Trust Laws.

In the same letter to the Indianapolis Central Labor Union Mr. Arnold wrote that his Department of Justice would invoke the anti-trust laws against unions only when they employed strikes, boycotts, or coercion for such purposes "as have no reasonable connection with wages, hours, health, safety, speed-up system or the establishment and maintenance of the right of collective bargaining . . ." These are purely weasel words. How can labor effectively combat the vicious speed-up system, how can it have a voice in determining wage rates in relation to the total production, etc., if it is denied the right to use its economic coercive power to regulate the use of "cheaper materials, improved equipment or more efficient methods?" In line with Mr. Arnold's reasoning, the workers would be denied the right to engage in sympathetic strikes, while the refusal to work with scab materials and scab labor would constitute an illegal monopolistic labor practice. Thus emasculated, the unions would be practically worthless; they might just as well disband and allow their New Deal "friends" such as Mr. Arnold and his fellow politicians, to look after their interests from Washington.

Peculiarly enough, at the very time Mr. Arnold and his New Deal pals were busy denouncing labor officials as conspirators in restraint of trade for blocking technological improvements, a New York Appellate Court decision was handed down holding that such practices by labor unions are perfectly legitimate. Coming as it does from an agency which never pretended to be friends of the workers like Mr. Arnold's Department of Justice, this decision is remarkable for its clear and cogent grappling with the realities of the class struggle.

The plaintiffs, Opera On Tour, Inc. had sued the Musicians' and Stagehands' unions, requesting an injunction to restrain them from interfering with its employment of stage hands. The unions had placed the opera company on the "unfair" list because it employed canned music instead of musicians. The company alleged that the discrimination of the unions against it constituted a restraint of trade. The lower court granted the injunction. On appeal this decision was reversed by the Appelate Division on the basis of the folowing reasoning:

> "The defendants, in order to secure what they believe to be their economic betterment are endeavoring to prevent use of a mechanical contrivance which

is in the nature of a labor-saving device. It is contended by the plaintiff that the objection to the use of machinery is an attempt to arrest progress . . .

"While many may deem this to be true, there are those who question the fact that we progress where we use machinery to such an extent that we destroy the opportunity for men to live by employment, and thus create vast numbers of permanent unemployed. IN ANY EVENT WE SEE NO REASON WHY IT IS NOT A LEGITIMATE OBJECT OF WORKINGMEN TO ATTEMPT BY LAWFUL MEANS TO LIMIT SUCH ALLEGED 'PROGRESS' WHEN IT RESULTS IN DIRECT INJURY TO THEM." (Our emphasis.)

So much for Mr. Thurman Arnold, the workingmen's friend. And now for some words of caution. In pillorying the labor-busting campaign of the Department of Justice, we by no means wish to imply that the American labor movement has its house in order and is above reproach. Far from it! It is only too true that American labor is vulnerable; its officials are often racketeers, careerists and fakers; its organizations are dominated by bureaucracies of the worst kind which hold the rank and file in check; many of its unions still continue anti-working class practices such as high initiation fees and closed books which bar large numbers of workers from membership.

BUT ONLY THE WORKERS THEMSELVES CAN SET THEIR HOUSE IN ORDER. For the workers to permit the government to intervene in their affairs would be the beginning of the end of the independence of labor organization. The old fable of the horse and the man is particularly apropos. The horse was menaced by a lion, and in terror for its life entered into an agreement with a man who offered to help vanquish the lion if the horse would only permit him to mount. The horse agreed. The lion was soon driven off, but the man would not dismount and ever after held the horse in subjection.

If labor fails to clean its own house by eliminating corruption, racketeers and labor fakers and by restoring control of the unions to the rank and file, with adequate safeguards for the protection of the democratic rights of holders of minority opinions, then it is simply inviting government regulation and ultimate emasculation and destruction.

This latest episode in the anti-labor campaign of American capitalism is rich in lessons for thinking workers.

Let us recall once again that it is not the forces of reaction, but the erstwhile "friend" of labor, the New Deal, that is dealing this lethal blow to labor. For while Arnold leads the campaign in public, it is Roosevelt who pulls the strings behind the scenes. The President is above all a politician, and his first loyalties are to the Democratic Party and to capitalism. There is a presidential campaign in the offing and Mr. Roosevelt's policy of throwing labor a few crumbs and plenty of verbal taffy has not sat well with his Southern supporters and the representatives of business in his councils.

These gentry believe that there have been entirely too many concessions to labor by the administration. This conviction has seriously disturbed the inner-party harmony of the Democrats and threatens their prospects of victory in November. Roosevelt has set out to wipe out this pro-labor taint. First came the WPA cuts, then the conspiracy trials of the Minneapolis WPA workers, and now the revitalizing of the Anti-Trust Laws and the indictments against labor officials. "All men of good will" should now be convinced that Roosevelt meant no harm by his flirtation with labor.

Once again the conclusion is clear: the workers cannot look to the capitalist government, nor to "friends" of labor among politicians, nor to "labor legislation" to solve the problems that are crowding around them. Labor can depend only on its own strength, its basic economic power, and its own class party to carry on the struggle against capitalist exploitation to a successful conclusion.

REFLECTIONS ON FORCE AND VIOLENCE

"SAY, how about you? You're always talking about a social revolution and overthrowing capitalism. That means force and violence, doesn't it? You must have signed that card with your tongue in your cheek!"

The speaker was a fellow WPA worker of somewhat reactionary tendencies, the time was last September and the card under discussion was the so-called loyalty pledge which all WPA workers were (and still are) required to sign on pain of separation from the payroll. It read as follows:

> I ..... residing at .....
> being an applicant or an employe paid from funds appropriated to the Works Progress Administration, do hereby certify that,
> I do not now, and will not at any time while paid for services from funds appropriated to the Works Project Administration, advocate or hold meberships in any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

Of course, I lost no time in setting him right. To begin with, he was wrong in the assumption that social revolution is the same thing as violence. A social revolution is a complete change in the structure of society and government. The *methods* by which such a change is brought about have no bearing upon whether or not it is a revolution. Violence does not make a social revolution, nor do peaceful, constitutional methods unmake it.

We Socialist Industrial Unionists are not pacifists who forswear the use of force under all circumstances. A fascist dictatorship, or a bunch of capitalist politicians who refused to turn over the reigns of government to the working class after they had been defeated at the ballot box, could only be dislodged by the use of force. But such a set of circumstances do not exist at the present time. Today the United States is still a political democracy where the ballot is in the hands of the majority of the people, who belong to the working class and is, consequently, a potential force for social revolution.

In theory at least, there is no limit to the changes in the social structure of the nation that this great majority of American citizens and their elected representatives might make if they so choose. There is no constitutional obstacle to prevent them from collectivizing the means of production and substituting an industrial administration for the political state. The organic laws of the land and the utterances of the fathers of the Republic assert this fact in essence. It is not even denied by the so-called criminal syndicalism laws which have been placed on the statute books of the majority of states during the past three decades. These laws do not (and could not as long as the Constitution is in effect) prohibit the advocacy of the most thorogoing revolutionary changes, provided they are to be accomplished via the medium of the ballot, but they *do* penalize the advocacy of such changes by the force and violence involved in the repudiation of the peaceful processes provided by political democracy. That being the case, the Socialist Union Party does not advocate the *violent* overthrow of the existing constitutional government of the United States.

And there are some other reasons why we take this position, the first of which is that to do otherwise would stand in the way of popular adhesion and understanding. Not the least of capitalism's achievements was the scrapping of the idea of the "divine right" of kings. Although capitalist political democracy has always been the protector of class rule and exploitation of labor, it has had the virtue of carrying with it the democratic ideal—the thought that the people as a whole were better fitted to be the architects of their own destiny than any overlord This is the spirit of the modern age, which the spread of capitalist political democracy has so imbedded in the consciousness of humanity that even tyrants such as Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin are forced to make a pretence of ruling with the consent of the majority. The cumpulsory referendums on national policy which the totalitarian gov-

(*Continued on page* 15)

DOES LABOR "SHARE" WITH CAPITAL

Pick up your newspaper any day and you will find some editorial or article which deals with labor's "share" in the national income. Listen to the representatives of A.F.L. or C.I.O. unions you will hear them discuss the problem of increasing labor's "share." Yet the fact is that labor does not "share" income at all; workers who enter into the labor process are paid a stipulated sum for their time, while the product and the income which is realized from its sale go entirely to the capitalist.

"Sharing" is a very innocent term, yet it serves to hide the real relationships which exist between the worker and his employer. The concept of "sharing" the wealth of society carries with it the totally false implication that labor enjoys a position of partnership with capital in present day production. Thus, we are told by capitalist apologists that the interests of capital and labor are identical, that what is good for the one is equally beneficial to the other. Many workers hold this same view.

Let us ask ourselves the question: Is it possible for the worker to obtain a "full share" of his product under the capitalist mode of production? If not, does the worker have any real interest in the preservation of the existing order as the capitalist press and even many labor leaders tell us?

The answer to those pertinent questions involves a consideration of the nature of wages as well as an examination of the workers' status under capitalism. Long ago Karl Marx dealt with these subjects, and so devastating was his analysis that capitalism moved with might and main to keep it from the working class. We propose here to paraphrase briefly Marx's treatment of "What Are Wages?"

According to the accepted capitalist definition, wages constitute labor's share of the wealth produced in society. This definition apparently is borne out by everyday experience. The worker appears to be a free agent. Purely as a result of his own voluntary action, he enters into a contract with his employer under the terms of which he agrees to work for a given period of time in exchange for a stipulated monetary return, i.e., wages.

Thus it seems that the product of the worker's toil is voluntarily and fairly divided between the capitalist and his employee. But let us look beneath the surface. We will take the concrete case of a Detroit auto worker employed by General Motors. This corporation supplies its workers with a fully-equipped plant and the necessary raw material for the production of automobiles. The individual worker employed by the corporation, in co-operation with his fellow workers similarly employed, produces an automobile. General Motors takes possession of this automobile and sells it for, let us say, $1,000.

Do the wages which the auto workers receive at the end of the day or week constitute a share of the particular automobile that they produced? By no means. Long before the car is sold or paid for the workers have received their stipulated wages. The wages came not from the proceeds of the automobiles produced by these workers, but out of money which was already on hand before they started working. The capitalist, General Motors, has not "shared" with the workers; on the contrary, it has purchased and paid for the use of a certain amount of the workers' time and ability, just as it has purchased and paid for certain quantities and qualities of raw materials and machinery which must enter into thefinished cars. THE LABOR POWER OF THE AUTOMOBILE WORKER IS ONE OF THE INSTRUMENTS OF LABOR ON A PAR WITH THE MECHANICAL MACHINERY. The worker no more shares in the product than do the sellers of the machines used by General Motors.

As Marx defined the term, "Wages are part of existing commodities with which the capitalist buys a certain amount of productive labor power." What is this commodity, labor power, which the capitalist purchases? It consists of the physical and mental capacity of the worker to

labor. Labor power is by no means synonymous with the laborer himself. The worker possesses other faculties in addition to his laboring power: there is the power to procreate, his power to enjoy cultural pursuits, his ability to engage in athletics, etc. The exercise of his labor power is only a part, even though under capitalism it is the most important part, of his existence.

Why does the worker sell his labor power to the capitalist? In order to obtain the means to continue his existence. The worker does not produce for himself the automobile he helps to turn out, the coal he mines or the silk he weaves. What he realizes for the sale of his labor power is a certain amount of wages which he must convert into food, clothing, shelter, etc., as a means of prolonging his own life. In short, his factory service does not constitute part of the worker's life; rather it is a sacrifice of his life. He really begins to live only after he leaves the factory and the domination of his employer.

Thus we see that under capitalism labor power is a commodity, sold by the worker and bought by the capitalist. The qualification, "under capitalism," is quite necessary, for under previous systems of society such a thing as a free laborer, selling his power to labor for wages, was the exception rather than the rule. Thus, in societies where chattel slavery prevailed the slave did not sell his labor power to his master, no more than the ox sells his labor to the farmer. On the contrary, the slave together with his labor power became the property of his owner, who purchased domination over the entire life of his chattel.

The free laborer under capitalism does not sell his entire body to the capitalist. He merely auctions off his capacity to work for a limited period, or, as Marx puts it, he sells himself by fractions. He auctions off 8 or 10 or more hours per day of his life to the highest bidder. The worker does not belong to an owner, but 8 or 10 or more hours of his daily life belong to whosoever buys them. The worker may leave the particular capitalist for whom he is working as often as he pleases, and the capitalist may discharge him. BUT THE WORKER, WHOSE ONLY SOURCE OF INCOME IS THE SALE OF HIS LABOR POWER, CANNOT LEAVE THE WHOLE CLASS OF BUYERS OF LABOR POWER, THE CAPITALIST CLASS, UNLESS HE GIVES UP HIS OWN EXISTENCE. Here we have the true measure of the worker's freedom under capitalism.

The capitalist class and its apologists vigorously deny that labor power is a commodity. It is inhuman and sacriligeous they cry, to compare human labor to potatoes, wheat or gasoline. So determined are they to keep alive the fiction that labor is a free agent that Congress and various State Legislatures have passed laws solemnly proclaiming that labor is not a commodity and is not to be considered as such. But all these vain pretenses are belied by the actual existence of things. A labor market, where the commodity labor power is bought and sold, exists side by side with a wheat market, a cotton market and a stock market. No amount of judicial pronouncements or legislative enactments can alter the basic

ATTENTION: MINNEAPOLIS READERS

Free Study Class

The Marxist-De Leonist Study Class and Discussion Group conducted under the auspices of the S.U.P. meets every Tuesday evening at 8 p.m. sharp at I.O.G.T. Hall, 1416 Second Street, Minneapolis.

The class combines a thorough grounding in the principles of Marxian economics and sociology with the practical application of Marxist theory to the problems confronting the working class.

LABOR POWER readers are urged to attend the sessions of this class and to invite their friends, neighbors and fellow workers to do likewise. There is no fee or obligation for attending.

laws of political economy, no more than they can repeal the law of gravitation.

We are now in a position to appreciate fully the utter hollowness of the contention that the workers are the "partners" of the capitalists in industry, "sharing" the proceeds of the nation's income between them. Now we can understand the fierceness of the capitalist onslaught against the scientific Socialist position that labor power is a commodity under capitalism. For once the workers awaken to a realization of their true position in society, and act to put an end to it, the jig will be up for capitalism.

The failure of the existing labor movement, including both the A.F.L. and the C.I.O., to recognize the significance of the commodity status of labor power has served to weaken and handicap the workers in their struggle against capitalist exploitation. To put an end to their present plight the workers must break with the outworn, outmoded and false concepts with which present-day unionism is imbued. They must proceed, on the basis of recognition of the existence of the class struggle, to recast their economic organizations along the lines of revolutionary Industrial Unionism. Their daily struggle against the encroachments of the employers must be carried forward under the banner of "Abolition of the wages system!"

DE LEONISM AND AMERICAN LABOR (II)

(*Continued from previous issue*)

Turning to the tactics and strategy of the revolutionary movement, DeLeon in "Two Pages from Roman History," drew upon the experience of the Roman proletariat in an analogous historical period to that of today to point certain lessons which the modern working class must learn. In the first of these "Pages" DeLeon warns against a menace threatening the workers from within their own ranks —the labor "leader" who is subservient to the interests of capital. After sketching the history of the "Plebs leaders" in ancient Rome who betrayed their fellow plebians in order to curry favor with the Patricians, De Leon showed, with example after example from the history of the modern labor movement, that the labor "leader" of today performs the identical function for capitalism. He climaxes this exposition by asking and answering the following question:

"Is the revolutionary class of this age, living under ripened conditions, to avail itself of its opportunity and fulfill its historic mission? Or is the revolutionary spark of our age to be smothered and banked up till, as in Rome of old, it leapt from the furnace a weapon of national suicide? . . .

"The answer depends, today, not upon a knowledge of scientific Socialist economics and sociology alone. It depends upon that and, hand in hand with that, upon an accurate knowledge of the strategic feature of the field. Nor is there a strategic post that the Socialist or Labor movement should keep its weather eye more firmly on and take more energetic measures against than the Labor leader . . . The Labor leader of today is nothing but a masked battery, from behind which the capitalist class can encompass what it could not without—the work of enslaving and slowly degrading the working class, and, along with that, the work of debasing and ruining the country."

Over 37 years have passed since DeLeon gave utterance to this prophetic vision. The passing years have only served to underscore, with ever-increasing emphasis, the danger of this capitalist outpost in the camp of labor. That the more intelligent sections of the capitalist class are fully aware of the importance of the Labor "leader" is proven by the close alliance between the Roosevelt New Deal administration and the bureaucracies of both the C.I.O and the A.F.L. And that these selfsame Labor lieutenants of the capitalist class are on the job muddling and bamboozling the workers into subservience to the wishes of their masters is proven by, among other things, their tacit if not open

support of the criminal war plans of the Roosevelt administration.

In the second "Page" from Roman history, De Leon uses the tragedy of the Brothers Gracchi to drive home the futility and the menace of reform in periods of revolutionary crisis. Tiberius Gracchus attempted to reform the rotten and disintegrating hulk of Roman society in the period of about 100 B. C. His work was cut short by assassination at the hands of the Senators. Gaius, his younger brother, then took up the uncompleted work of Tiberius and carried on for awhile, until he was deserted by the proletariat, which failed to understand that he was attempting to aid them. He fled Rome and committed suicide to avoid capture by his enemies. De Leon comments:

"I hope I have made the point clear enough to warant the conclusion that the situation that confronted the Gracchi at about 100 B. C. had passed the stage of reform. No tinkering could any longer stead. No enactment of 'laws' and waiting for their slow operation could then touch the evils that afflicted Rome, and, along with Rome her Italian domain. The day for constitutional methods was gone by. - Whenever a nation has reached that point, there are no longer 'institutions' in existence: the institutions have become shadows. There is extant nothing but *usurpation.* In such emergencies nothing short of revolution is in order."

The Gracchi, however, in the face of these social conditions, contented themselves with tinkering with forms and attempting to reform the outworn political institutions. Thus they played directly into the hands of the counter-revolution which found it an easy task to dispose of them.

Summing up the tactical lessons of the blunders committed by the Gracchi, De Leon emphasized that insufficient attention had been given to the peculiar weakness characteristic of the proletariat: their poverty and insecurity, which render workers easy victims of movements which offer sops, baits or lures. The Labor or Socialist movement cannot allow itself to be used as a catspaw for the capitalist class by advocating "improvements" which cannot improve the condition of the workers but which meanwhile lulls them to sleep with the idea that something is being done for them.

"Improvements," De Leon held, "are in the very nature of things so many lures to allow the revolutionary heat to radiate into vacancy. They are even worse than that: they are opportunities for the usurper to prosecute his own usurpatory purposes under the guise,aye, with the aid and plaudits of his victims, who imagine they are commanding, he obeying, their bidding."

Here again De Leon spoke with prophetic vision. In 1933, when American capitalism was mortally wounded and a revolutionary ferment was beginning to stir the workers, it was the Roosevelt New Deal with its program of social reform which came to the rescue. In De

Daniel De Leon

"The only man who has added anything to Socialist theory since Marx and Engels."

—*N. Lenin.*

All workers owe it to themselves to become acquainted with the works of one who is universally conceded to be America's foremost revolutionist and Marxian theoretician. Knowledge is power!

We recommend:—

Reform and Revolution 5c
What Means This Strike? 5c
Socialist Reconstruction of Society 10c
Burning Question of Trades Unionism 10c

The following pamphlets, containing the De Leonist position on their respective questions, will be published soon:—

Socialism or Dictatorship? 5c
War and the Working Class 5c
Fascism or Socialism? 5c

Send all orders to: P.O. Box No. 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.

Leon's language, this task was accomplished under the guise of coming to the assistance of the suffering masses and with the air and plaudits of the masses who were led to believe that their welfare was the primary consideration motivating the New Deal. Down to the present day large masses of workers continue to look upon Roosevelt as the Moses who is leading them out of the wilderness of capitalism's miseries, despite the failure of every one of his attempts to alleviate their distress.

One of the most important canons of the tactics of proletarian revolution laid down by De Leon wsa:

"The revolutionist must never throw sops at the revolutionary element. The instant he does, he places himself at the mercy of his foe; he can always be outsopped . . . Nothing is more demagogic than usurpation."

Recent political history richly confirms this cardinal tenet. Let us take only one example to illustrate how vital it is to refuse to make false promises to the working class. In 1934, Upton Sinclair ran his famous campaign for election as Governor of California on the Democratic ticket, under the slogan of "End Poverty in California," (later shor ened to EPIC). After Roosevelt with his New Deal hocus pocus had stolen the thunder of Mr. Sinclair's reformist Socialist Party, this brilliant tactician conceived the idea of turning the tables on the capitalist class by entering the Democratic primaries and capturing the nomination on a "production for use" platform. Mr. Sinclair was successful in capturing the nomination. One of the chief planks in his platfrom was the provision for monthly pensions of $50. to citizens over 60 years of age. Let Mr. Sinclair tell the rest of the story:

"I taked this pension program all over the state, including Long Beach, and a physician of that city made note of the applause. He went off and thought it over. If $50. got that much applause, $200. ought to get four times as much . .

"So came the Townsend Plan and very soon at our EPIC meetings old folks would rise up and ask what I thought of it."

Well, as might have been expected, Mr. Sinclair did not think very highly of this competitive plan. The result was, as Mr. Sinclair relates, "So Dr. Townsend's old folks said I was an atheist and a Communist and did not vote for me; so I was not elected Governor." ("Letters to Joe" —*Industrial Worker,* Dec. 17, 1938).

And so Mr. Sinclair learned by bitter experience that his "practical" Socialism was not so practical after all and that reformers who stoop to sopping the workers soon find themselves outsopped, outbid and left far behind by their unscrupulous and demagogic competitors.

In these days, when the menace of fascist reaction and its unprincipled demagogy is growing apace, when, would-be fuehrers are prepared to promise the masses anything and everything, De Leon's teachings serve "as a bell-buoy to warn the Socialist movement of the sunken ropes in its course."

De Leon's contributions to the Socialist movement were by no means limited to the political field; equally brilliant were his efforts on the economic front.

From the very first, De Leon threw himself whole-heartedly into the trades union movement of his day. Already in 1888 he had joined the Knights of Labor, where, in a short time, his outstanding qualities had won for him a position of influence and leadership. De Leon waged unceasing warfare against the clique of labor fakers who were rapidly running the organization into the ground. Although he was successful in driving the fakers from the famous New York District Assembly 49, and in winning it over to the cause of class-conscious unionism, he found the national leadership too firmly entrenched to dislodge. After repeated efforts to cleanse the organization failed, De Leon became convinced that the Knights of Labor, like its contemporary, the American Federation of Labor, was hopelessly corrupt and reactionary.

Accordingly, in 1895, District Assembly 49, under the guiding hands of De Leon and other S.L.P. luminaries, seceded from the Knights of Labor and proceeded to organize the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance, the first English-speaking

trades union based on revolutionary principles. The new organization waged a number of outstanding militant labor battles, but it never succeeded in attracting any considerable number of workers to its ranks. Moreover, its growth was hampered by the split in the ranks of Socialism which resulted from disagreement with De Leon's refusal to confine Socialist trade union activity to "boring from within" only.

Although the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance was revolutionary to the core, its form was in no way different than the A.F.L. which it sought to replace. However, in its propaganda and organizational campaigns it was the first working class organization to raise the banner of Industrial Unionism, and with the formation of the Industrial Workers of the World, the S.T.&L.A. turned over its constituent locals to the more advanced body.

The I.W.W., the original Socialist Industrial Union, was organized in 1905 by the most advanced and militant elements within the American Labor movement including, besides De Leon, Eugene V. Debs, Bill Haywood, Charles Moyer, Father Haggerty and William E. Trautman. At the organizing convention De Leon played a leading role in launching the I.W.W. on a sound Marxian basis. The new organization started out with high hopes of developing into a fighting mass organization of the workers which would successfully challenge the A.F.L. with its insidious poison of the "brotherhood of capital and labor." But as before in the case of the K. of L. and the S.T. & L.A., these hopes never materialized.

The I.W.W. contained within itself the seed of its own destruction, in the shape of the deadly anarcho-syndicalist microbe which soon openly began to gnaw at its vitals. De Leon once again took the lead in combatting the slum elements and their anarchist philosophy, waging a brilliant and energetic campaign for three years, but to no avail. The anarchos succeeded in packing the 1908 convention, unseating De Leon as a delegate, and raising the standard of "direct action" in place of political action the I.W.W. had previously endorsed. This convention marked the real death of the I.W.W. For a number of years thereafter, the anarchist I.W.W. enjoyed a fitful and sensational existence. With the outbreak of the World War, however, the Federal government dealt it a crushing blow, aided by the weapon which the "direct actionists" had put into their hands; its leaders were imprisoned, its rank and file persecuted, until it was all but exterminated. It manages to linger on today as a burned out hulk.

After his defeat in the I.W.W., De Leon retired from active participation in economic activity. He took little part in the activities of the Detroit I.W.W. which the expelled S.L.P. elements organized, and never joined its ranks. Until his death in 1914 he devoted his efforts primarily to the political movement, although he continued to keep a sharp eye on the checkered course of American unionism.

The Role of the Union

Philosophically, the IWW was the result of the intellectual labor of De Leon, who, at the same time that he was crossing swords with the labor fakers in the old trade union movement, was hammering out in the columns of the *People* the basic principles of his new and distinctive philosophy of unionism, which was later to be termed Socialist Industrial Unionism.

In his early days as a Socialist De Leon attached only a subordinate importance to the economic arm of labor. The union, most Socialists then held, was only a temporary weapon which served to ward off the day-to-day encroachments of the employers; nothing more. As late as 1902, in his classic "Two Pages from Roman History," De Leon gave no hint that he believed the union would play any important role in the emancipation of labor.

In thus subordinating the union to the political movement, the early Socialists were merely following in the footsteps of Marx and Engels themselves. De Leon was the first Marxist to see and formulate clearly the necessity of the two-fold organization of the working class on both the economic and the political fields, with

the economic organization playing the primary and the permanent role. In 1904, in his epoch-making address "The Burning Question of Trades Unionism," De Leon for the first time refined the historic mission of unionism:

"In the first place, the trades union has a supreme mission. That mission is nothing short of organizing by uniting, and uniting by organizing, the whole working class industrially—not merely those for whom there are jobs, accordingly, not only those who can pay dues. This unification or organization is essential in order to save the eventual and possible victory from bankruptcy, by enabling the working class to assume and conduct production from the moment the guns of the public powers fall into its hands—or before, if need be, if capitalist chicanery polutes the ballot box. The mission is important also in that the industrial organization forecasts the future constituencies of the parliament of the Socialist Republic . . .

"Civilized society will know no such ridiculous thing as geographic constituencies. It will only know industrial constituencies. The parliament of civilization in America will consist, not of Congressmen from geographic ristricts, but of representatives of trades throughout the land, and their legislative work will not be the complicated one which a society of conflicting interests, such as capitalism, requires but the easy one which can be summed up in the statistics of the wealth needed, the wealth producible, and the work required—and that any average set of workingmen's representatives are fully able to ascertain, infinitely better than our modern rhetoricians in Congress."

In other words, under Socialism the administrative organ of production will be the Industrial Union, composed of every member of society; and planning, management and distribution will be in the hands of the democratically chosen representatives of the producers. That is why it is of the utmost importance for the workers to organize along the lines of Industrial Unionism today, not merely to wage the every-day battle against the exploiters, but to prepare the organization which will one day assume the conduct of society. In thus projecting the role of the economic organization of labor into Socialism, De Leon was able to make the only original contribution to Socialist theory since the days of Marx and Engels.

The Road to Power

De Leon accepted unreservedly the basic Marxist concept that the labor movement is essentially political and that the class struggle between the workers and the capitalist class must finally culminate in the struggle for political power. Nevertheless, it has become fashionable with De Leon's critics to speak disparagingly of his "syndicalist" ideas—this in the face of the fact that De Leon waged a never-ceasing compaign against the motley array of anarchist and anti-political forces in the labor movement. It was De Leon's insistence of the importance of the role of unionism that formed the only basis for the erroneous criticisms by his political opponents. De Leon's emphasis on economic power arose from his study of the difference between all previous social revolutions and the coming proletarian revolution. He wrote:

"The proletariat must seek for the needed power elsewhere. Their numbers alone will not do it: the larger a mob the weaker and the more general the rout. Numbers however, crystalized and drilled into organization are omnipotent. The power needed by the proletariat is the 'properly constituted' economic organization . . ."

Here De Leon laid down the basic tactical law of modern proletarian revolution. This De Leonist theory has been thoroughly verified by the entire post-war history of the working class movement throughout the world. The Russian Bolshevik Revolution was a striking confirmation of De Leonism. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the triumph of the October revolution was primarily due to the wholehearted support of the trade union movement, that without this support the revolution would have collapsed. In a statement by the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party issued on July 3, 1922 it is acknowledged that:

"That which made Red October possible was the fact that the banner of proletarian revolt was at the same time the banner of the trade union movement in Russia. The Soviet Republic triumphed over its innumerable foes because the trade unions, which united the whole working class of Russia, gave the Proletarian Government all possible support."

Even the rise of Hitler to power in Germany furnished proof of the correctness of De Leon's teachings, although unfortunately for the working class, in reverse. When R. Palme Dutt, the foremost English-speaking Stalinist theoretician was attempting to justify the sorry role played by the Communist Party in the defeat of the German proletariat, he made this highly significant excuse:

"The figure of six million Communist electors is a deceptive measure of the real fighting strength, because the real fighting strength of the working class *depends upon the employed industrial workers in large-scale industry.* It was precisely here that the Communist Party was weak."—"Fascism and Social Revolution," page 150 (Our emphasis)

What is this but a backhand way of admitting that De Leon's theories worked in practice? Here, from the camp of his worst enemies we find the strongest possible confirmation of the importance of the role that the economic organization plays in the modern revolution.

The Union Under Socialism

De Leon's concept that the Industrial Union is the embryo of the social organization of the future Socialist order, constituted its originator, in the language of Lenin, "the only one who has added anything to Socialist thought since Marx." For neither Marx nor his co-worker Engels had been able to foresee clearly the form under which society would operate once classes were abolished and the means of production concentrated in the hands of the people as a whole. This was a problem, the solution to which was of the utmost importance to the working class since it pointed out how the workers must organize under capitalism in order to assume the reins of production immediately upon the overthrow of their exploiters. As we have seen, it was De Leon who fillled this gap in Socialist science with his contribution of Socialist Industrial Unionism.

* * *

Now, as never before, do the times cry out for the workers to adopt the principles of De Leonism, of revolutionary Socialism. In this period of capitalist reaction and working class apathy, with the forces of capitalism in the ascendancy because of the apostasy of Stalinism, the ideals and teachings of De Leon offer the only means to the militants in the labor movement to meet the onslaughts of the onrushing fascist reaction, which threatens to engulf American labor unless the workers shake off their present inertia.

By his imperishable contributions to the science of Socialism in the field of proletarian strategy and tactics, as well as by his unyielding struggles on behalf of the working class movement, Daniel De Leon has carved for himself an everlasting niche in the Hall of Fame of the proletarian revolution.

—Abraham Ziegler

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS AND READERS

Due to the fact that it was decided to move the date of publication forward from the 15th to the 1st of the month, Labor Power did not appear, as it regularly has, since its inception, in January.

All subscriptions will, accordingly be advanced one issue and our other readers now know that they have not missed an issue of this revolutionary Socialist journal.

—The Business Manager

REFLECTIONS ON VIOLENCE

(*Continued from page 6*)

ernments hold from time to time are nothing other than a reluctant obeisance to the dictum of the age that the voice of the people shall be supreme.

When, in the face of such a state of affairs, a political party advocates the use of force before a peaceful trial of strength has taken place at the ballot box, it convicts itself of lack of confidence in the logic of its program and its ability to win the majority of the masses to its support. Nay more—it brands itself as an anti-democratic clique of would-be dictators, bent upon forcing its will upon the masses without their consent. Such a party can never hope to win the great mass of the American working class to its support because its attitude violates every concept of civilization and decency that they hold dear. This point, however, is one that our budding commissars who draw their inspiration from Lenin can never seem to understand. By this we do not mean to imply that these r-r-revolutionists are dumb. Far from it. As a matter of fact they are quite smart and educated on some things. They can quote you, word for word, everything that Lenin said to Trotsky in 1905 or any other time. They can write long-winded "theses" giving supposedly expert opinions upon a correct program for the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Baluchistan or the economic problems of the South African bushmen. (They even know what a Plenum is!) But they have been so busy studying these things that they haven't had time to get wise to the historical and social background of the country in which they live. But perhaps we shouldn't be too hard on them for that. You can't expect even a prospective commissar to know *everything*.

Besides being an obstacle to popular support, the advocacy of force and violence is a grievous tactical error. It lays the unprotected flanks of the revolutionary forces open to attack by the class enemy. By instinct and reason the capitalist class sees in the revolutionary labor movement an implacable foe who must be destroyed at all costs. But as long as the revolutionary hosts continue to occupy the plane of civilization and democracy, this is impossible without a brazen attack upon the very institutions which capitalism pretends to uphold and which the masses have been taught to revere. Desperation has not yet driven the ruling class to a point where they are willing to unmask themselves and brave popular reaction by such a course. However, let the party of the revolutionary working class repudiate a peaceful trial of strength at the ballot box and the ruling class has been given the opening it is looking for. It comes forward as the champion of civilization and democracy against those who would assail them and proceeds to destroy democratic rights in the name of freedom.

When the time comes (and come it will) that American capitalism needs an American equivalent of the Reichstag fire in the shape of faked "red" plots to alter the institutions of this country violently and without the consent of the people, they will have the writings of our native commissars to point to as a justification for their contention that these plots are the real thing. Of course, everyone who really knows the commissars knows also that their interest in violence is largely academic and that, should any bloodshed occur, they would probably exceed the speed limit in getting as far as possible away from the scene of the carnage. But that is all beside the point. The majority of the American working class do not know the commissars as well as we of the labor movement do. Following the charming old American custom of taking everyone at face value, they would probably agree with the contention that the "plots" were genuine.

While, as the standard bearer of a higher civilization than now exists, the Socialist Union Party does not propose to adopt the methods of the stone age, it does not go to the opposite extreme of pure and simple political Socialism and say that the ballot alone is an all-sufficient weapon of working class emancipation. To do so would be to ignore the lessons that history has taught us. No parasitic class in the records of humanity has ever relinquished its privilege of living off the labor of others without a bitter physical

battle to maintain its position. We had an instance of that in our own country during the past century when the Southern slave-holding aristocracy revolted against the mandate of the ballot that elected Lincoln to the presidency and were only subdued after four long years of bloody civil war. There is no reason to think that the present ruling class is constituted differently or that it will act differently.

Historical development has made our capitalists a class of incorrigible individualists to whom classic political democracy is the ideal governmental system because it gives free rein to that individualistic impulse and allows each one of them to manage his own business as he sees fit. But if it comes to a choice of submitting to a victorious working class or surrendering that freedom of action in favor of Fascism, there can be no doubt that they would adopt the latter course without a moment's hesitation. The ballot is a great moral force, but a working class party with serious intentions of invading capitalist property rights, which opposed the entrenched power of that class with moral force alone, would be committing suicide. The day of its victory would be the day of its defeat.

With this fact in mind, the Socialist Union Party has set for itself the task of bringing into being a physical power which the working class will be able to use against the capitalist class should they rebel against the mandate of the revolutionary ballot or try to set up a Fascist dictatorship to prevent such a mandate from being made. That power can arise only from the control of the means by which society lives. This economic power is the source of all other forms of social strength. Every fundamental social change in the history of mankind has been the result of its use.

We workers operate the industries. Everything worthwhile in the world is the product of our brain and brawn! The capitalists are a group of coupon clippers. They have degenerated to such an extent that they even delegate the job of inventing new refinements in the art of skinning labor to their hirelings.

This fact gives our class the potential ability to control the means of existence and with it the actions of states and the movements of armed forces. But that power will remain diffused and ineffective until the working class utilizes the productive organization into which capitalism has herded it to build a fighting union upon an industrial basis. When that happens and when the working class is aware of the need for doing away with capitalism, the Socialist Industrial Union will be a fact.

With the Socialist Industrial Union in existence the working class would be able to withhold war supplies from a would-be Franco. It could equip and maintain the armies of liberty until he were crushed. Built upon industrial lines, with representatives from all useful pursuits sitting in its councils, the Socialist Industrial Union would be the nucleus of the administrative organs of the new social order that is destined to replace capitalism.

Such is the Socialist Industrial Union, a fool-proof guarantee against the repetition, in this country, of such mistakes and consequent defeats as have overtaken the working class of Spain and other countries during the past few troubled years. It doesn't exist now. It will not be created by mere wishful thinking or abstract "revolutionary" propaganda. It must spring from the present discordant, misled and divided labor movement, which must be revamped along the correct lines by the combination of education and activity which is the function of a truly revolutionary party of the working class.

To do this, to organize the millions of unionless workers and, finally, to give the entire working class an understanding of their position under capitalism together with the need of building a new social order is the job before us now. It is one worthy of the best efforts of every class conscious worker.

C. E. C.

DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO LABOR POWER.

THE WORKER AND "CO-OPERATION"

(Special Corespondence)

MINNEAPOLIS —The state of Minnesota is one of the strongholds of the Co-operative Movement in the United States. An active group of paid propagandists carry on an intensive campaign seeking to fill the minds of the workers in the Northwest with the alleged virtues of Co-operation as a remedy for the evils which beset them.

In keeping with its policy of applying in practice the economic theories of Marxism, the Study Class of Branch Minneapolis of the S.U.P. arranged for a symposium on the Co-operative Movement. Mr. George Carney, who is prominently identified with Co-operation in the Northwest, presented the case for his panacea. The symposium and the discussion and question period which followed proved so interesting and instructive that we are passing on some of its highlights to the readers of LABOR POWER.

In his opening talk Mr. Carney stressed the fact that the workers were exploited as consumers and not as producers, and that if the workers would turn their backs on private industry, organize themselves as consumers, and set up their own Co-operative industries, they would soon freeze out capitalism, just as easy as that, without any revolution and without any fuss.

When the question and discussion period began Mr. Carney received quite a surprise. For once his audience failed to warm up to the consumers' paradise he had pictured.

The first questioner was a student who wanted to know just what class in society the consumer represented and what his economic interests were. Since the speaker had stated that all of us were consumers and had interests in common, just what were the common interests of the worker with J. P. Morgan and his ilk who "consumed" steam yachts, castles in Scotland and the most delectable luxuries the world was capable of producing? And, finally, if there was one law of consumption for the J. P. Morgans and a different one for the workers, just how were these laws determined?

Mr. Carney's attempt to answer this question was really pitiful. He, too, he informed the class, was opposed to exploitation. He recognized that capitalism had crying evils, etc., etc. That is why he believed in organizing co-operatively to do away with the tyranny of private industry. But he said not one word in reply to the series of questions raised as to what class in society the consumer represented. The student of scientific Marxian economics can of course understand Mr. Carney's reticence. There is no such animal as a "consumer" in economic science. One is either a producer (a manual or mental worker) or a parasite or a retainer of the parasites who monopolize the social means of production.

Mr. Carney was next asked, "Where are the workers to get the necessary money and means with which to build up their own industries in competition with the private industrial monopoly of the capitalist class? Such a task will necessitate tens of billions of dollars. From what sources are these sums to be forthcoming?" In answer to this forthright question Carney indulged in another exhibition of mental acrobatics. This time the workers were to starve out the capitalist class with their "vast" purchasing power!

Bit by bit the assembled students tore down the house of cards that Carney had erected to shelter his Co-operative Movement. One student inquired, "You tell the workers that you are neutral in politics; but how about the capitalist class and its government; are they neutral? Will they stand by idly and permit you to divest them of their monopoly without taking steps to protect their interests?" Mr. Carney really couldn't say! And so it went.

During his presentation Carney referred in glowing terms to the success of the Co-operative Movement in Europe. In America, he granted, the movement was still in its swaddling clothes but in Europe—in England, in Belgium, in the Scandinavian countries—there the Co-operative Move-

ment was really accomplishing things and going places.

"Mr. Carney," asked a student, "Is it not true that although the Co-operative Movement in the European countries to which you referred is more than fifty years old and embraces practically a majority of the working class within its ranks, despite this tremendous growth the standards of living in those countries are very considerably lower than those prevailing here in America, which has not had the advantage of the Co-operative Movement? *And further, isn't it true that real wages in those countries have actually fallen in the last fifty years, once more in spite of or perhaps because of the tremendous growth of the Co-operatives?"*

Mr. Carney couldn't see what connection the growth of the Co-operative Movement had with the fall of real wages. Patiently the questioner became an instructor and pointed out that under capitalism labor power, or the worker's capacity to produce, is a commodity; that its value is determined (after making due allowance for certain historical factors) by the amount of food, clothing, shelter, etc. necessary to reproduce that labor power; that consequently, if the Co-operative Movement was successful in reducing the cost of living, the bosses wouldn't waste any time in reducing wages accordingly. This was precisely what had happened in those European nations where the Co-operative Movement was so powerful. Thus, concluded the student, Co-operation turns out to be a millstone around the neck of labor dragging its wages down ever lower and lower.

Comrade Ziegler, instructor of the class, summed up the discussion on behalf of the S.U.P. He pointed out that the basic error of the Co-operative Movement's proponents lay in the fact that they failed to recognize the scientific economic truth that the worker is robbed at the point of production—in the shops, factory, mine, mill, etc.—and not at the point of consumption, as a buyer. Discounting individual cases of cheating, which were cancelled out by the law of averages, the workers as consumers merely pay the true values of the commodities they buy. However, a consumer is not an economic category, no more than is a sleeper, or a two-eyed man. All men, in all societies, consumed and slept and were born with two eyes; and they will continue to do so long after the capitalist system has passed on.

The distinctive social relationships under capitalist production are those of wage worker and capitalist—those who produce and those who own the machines which make production possible. Capital pays the worker wages which represent in money the value of his labor power (the cost of its reproduction, as gauged by the cost of living modified by certain historical factors). Capital keeps for itself, however, the full product of the worker's toil, which represents in value many times the amount of the wages paid. This withheld surplus value is the basis of the capitalist system of production. Capital is able to exploit the worker in this manner because of its private ownership of the social means of production, which has reduced the worker to the status of a commodity, compelled to sell his labor power in order to live.

The only solution of the social problem arising out of this set-up, concluded Comrade Ziegler, lies in the abolition of this private ownership of socially-needed means of production and the institution of the Industrial Republic, in which the means of production would be socially owned and democratically operated by the useful members of society, the producers, in contrast to their operation by the parasites as at present. But such a change requires a thoroughgoing social revolution by which the workers, organized politically and industrially, expropriate the capitalist class and assume the conduct of society's affairs.

The Co-operative Movement, by teaching false economics (that the worker is robbed not as a producer, but as a consumer) and by preaching "neutrality" in politics, thus enabling the capitalist class to maintain its control of the machinery of government, is befuddling the minds of the workers and playing into the hands of the capitalist class, wittingly or unwittingly. The Co-operative Movement is a

snare and a delusion, in that it can never replace capitalist industries as long as private ownership in the means of production remains, and insofar as its growth and expansion must inevitably be accompanied by a lowering of the wage levels of the workers generally. All class conscious workers should spare no effort to expose its fallacies!

ORGANIZATION NOTES

(*Continued from page 2*)

tacts were made, as well as some solid organizational gains.

The Branch is continuing the class and an intensified program of organizational activities planned. However, the extreme cold, with temperatures as low as 20 degrees below zero, has handicapped activities considerably. With the coming of warmer weather the Branch will make up for lost time.

WALTER LIPPMAN'S TRUE CONFESSION

"The Dies committee are not really a legislative committee. They are a kind of committee of public safety set up by Congress to suppress activities which, though detested by the great majority of people, are in themselves either not unlawful, or, even if they were outlawed, could not be dealt with by the ordinary procedure of the law. The Dies committee are official vigilantes operating in an area, that of the political underworld, where there is as yet no effective law and there is, therefore, no order. The committeemen, like their vigilante predecessors on the American frontier, are, therefore, themselves often lawless in spirit and disorderly in their methods.

"This accounts for the somewhat shamefaced approval which thoughtful men have given to the work of the committee. The public is confronted with the ancient question of whether the end justifies the means. Thus, only the very innocent and self-deluding have any doubt that the Dies committee have been attacking a formidable evil in modern society. The menace is real. It is not imaginary. And it must be met. Yet there is no doubt also that the procedure of the Dies committee is itself a violation of American morality: it is a pillory in which reputations are ruined, often without proof and always without the legal safeguards that protect the ordinary criminal; it is a tribunal before which men are arraigned and charged with acts that are, as a matter of fact, lawful.

"Therefore, the end, which is to protect the American system, is attained by means which, if used for some other end, would be deplored by every one . . ."—"Today and Tomorrow," January 11, 1940.

ATTENTION:

New York Workers

●

DEBATE

●

Resolved:

"That the Dictatorship of the proletariat Is necessary in the United States."

●

Affirmative:

Revolutionary Workers League, U. S. (Fighting Worker)

Speaker: Jules Bertman

Negative:

Socialist Union Party

Speaker: A. Ziegler, National Secy.

●

Sunday, February 18—8:30 p. m.

●

IRVING PLAZA HALL

Irving Place and 15th St., N. Y. C.

●

ADMISSION 10c

WORKERS! THIS IS *YOUR* PAPER!

This paper is a fearless champion of the working class and fights its battles as they must be fought. It wars on foes within and without the labor movement. It gives battle to the capitalist enemy on the open field of war; it unmasks his false teachings, his false political economy, his insidious efforts to chloroform labor. But it turns also upon the misleader of labor in the working class ranks. It will tolerate no false prophets, no pernicious principles, humbug economics, least of all will it remain silent when the workers are deceived or sold out either by vacillating or corrupt "labor leaders."

This paper fights for a cause. It demands the emancipation of labor and the inauguration of Socialism. It stops at nothing short of that!

Do you want to learn what is wrong with the country?

Do you wish to understand the manoeuvres of the political parties of capitalism?

Do you wish to know why the lot of labor does not improve?

Do you wish to know why Labor is made the "goat"?

Do you desire to know why strikes are lost?

Do you desire to know how to organize to defeat the capitalist class?

YOU DO? Then read **Labor Power.** Subscribe! Help build it.

SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Directory of Branches

MINNEAPOLIS
1416 Second Street, South

LOS ANGELES
221 South Spring St.

CHICAGO
Box 1,
34 South Peoria Street

NEW YORK
1301 Boston Road

Send orders and remittances to BUSINESS MANAGER, "LABOR POWER," P. O. Box No. 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.